

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

1. Rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito (US 6,427,288) in view of Buxton et al. (US 6,115,025, hereinafter "Buxton").

**Response:**

Independent claims 1 and 5 have been amended to distinguish from the cited prior art. Each of these claims now states that the shaft comprises at least one handle connected to the display panel for a user to move the shaft, the position of each handle being adjustable with respect to the display panel. This amendment is fully supported in Figures 21-23, as well as paragraph [0033] of the specification. No new matter is added.

In contrast, Saito teaches that an end of the housing of the display unit 20 is used as a handle for moving the display unit. Likewise, Buxton's display 32 can also be rotated by grabbing the housing of the display 32. However, neither Saito nor Buxton teaches a handle connected to the display panel for a user to move the shaft, where each handle is adjustable with respect to the display panel. Because of this, the cited prior art does not provide an adjustable handle for use in allowing a user to conveniently position the interface apparatus. Additionally, neither Saito nor Buxton mention or provide any motivation for adding handles that extend from the outer rims of their displays for rotating the displays. Due to this limitation, the designs of Saito and Buxton make it less convenient for users to rotate the display.

Since the combination of Saito and Buxton does not teach all of the limitations contained in the currently amended claims 1 and 5, the applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 5 are patentable. Furthermore, claims 4 and 8 are dependent on claims 1 and 5, and should be allowed if their respective

base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 4, 5, and 8 is therefore respectfully requested.

2. Rejection of claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a):

5                Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito in view of Buxton, and further in view of Gong et al. (US7,034,814).


**Response:**

10                Claims 3 and 7 are dependent on claims 1 and 5, and should be allowed if their respective base claims are allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1, 4, 5, and 8 is therefore respectfully requested.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

15

Sincerely yours,



Date: 11/08/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

20    P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

25    Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 13 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 10 PM in Taiwan.)